

Remarks:

In reply to the Office Action of June 10, 2008, Applicants note the Examiner's objection to the foreign language documents cited in the IDS filed February 1, 2007. Applicants have searched for, but have been unable to find any English language equivalents of the two articles by B. Wulforth and W. Albrecht. While applicants understand that the Examiner may not be able to evaluate the claims with respect to these two articles, applicants submit that they have fulfilled their duty of disclosure under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56. As to EP 0774343 A1, applicants have identified and submit herewith an English language abstract for consideration by the Examiner.

In further reply to the Office Action of June 10, 2008, have amended claim 51 to replace the acronyms PTFE and PI with the full identification of the compounds being claimed; namely, polytetrafluorethylene and polyimide, respectively. The acronym PTFE is uniquely recognized in the polymer field as standing for polytetrafluorethylene. The acronym PI is identified as standing for polyimide at page 4, line 9 of the original specification, which is in paragraph [0012] of the published application. Accordingly, applicants request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 51 on the basis of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicants have also replaced the expression "half-stuff" in claim 39 with "intermediate product." The term "half-stuff" is commonly used to refer to an intermediate product that is then used to form a final product.<sup>1</sup> The term "half-stuff" has been deleted

---

<sup>1</sup> half-stuff *Pronunciation:* (haf'stuf", häf'-), —*n.* (in a manufacturing process) any material half formed, esp. partly prepared pulp for making paper. Also, **half-stock** *Pronunciation:* (haf'stok", häf'-). *Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, Copyright © 1997, by Random House, Inc.

from claim 65. Applicants request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39 – 57 and 65 - 72 on the basis of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

All of the claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 on the basis of a combination of Chenoweth et al. USP 4,946,738 with Haque et al. USP 7,294,218. Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection in as much as Haque et al. is NOT prior art to this application. Haque et al. has a filing date of November 18, 2004, however the present application has an international filing date of April 1, 2004, which is more than six-months before that of Haque et al. Even if one were to rely on the parent application of which Haque et al. is a continuation-in-part, that application was filed on October 17, 2003, but the Applicants of the present application are entitled to rely on their foreign priority application filed April 25, 2003, which is nearly six-months prior. Accordingly, any proposed rejection of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 103 on the basis of any combination of references including Haque et al. is improper and should be withdrawn.


As to Chenoweth et al., applicants agree with the Examiner that the glass fibers disclosed in the reference could correspond to the applicants' claimed reinforcing fibers. Applicants also agree that Chenoweth et al. is silent as to the basis weight to the non-woven material, but that is not the only shortcoming of Chenoweth et al. For example, Chenoweth et al. is additionally silent as to any requirement of the relative length of the first fiber in relation to the reinforcing fiber. All of applicant's independent claims require that "the fiber length of the first fibre being smaller than that of the reinforcing fibre." Paragraph [0008] of applicants' published application indicates that "it is essential that, in the nonwoven mat, the melt fibres have a smaller fibre length than the reinforcing fibre." Paragraph [0009] of

applicants' published application continues with "[a]s a result of the fact that the fibre length of the melt fibre is smaller than that of the reinforcing fibre, a homogeneous mixing of the two types of fibre is achieved so that, in the case of subsequent further processing of the half-stuff, a uniform homogeneous distribution of the reinforcing fibre in the fibre composite is then achieved." Chenoweth et al. does not disclose any fiber length selection criterion whatsoever that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to this aspect of the applicants' claimed invention.

Applicants' claims are believed to be patentable over the art of record. The amendments to the claims made by the applicants were merely to address the Section 112 issues, and not to any issue raised by the prior. To the extent that the Examiner cites new art to reject any of the claims of this application, such rejection must be non-final as no new issues of patentability have been presented by this amendment. Should the Examiner feel that some minor change to the claims, which could be addressed by an Examiner's amendment, would place this case in condition for allowance, the subscribing attorney would welcome a phone conference.

Respectfully submitted,

12/5/08  
Date

  
A. James Richardson 26,983